

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application.

New Matter Issue:

Claims 1 and 3 – 7 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification. In particular, the Office Action identifies the claimed “second converter”. As now amended, the “second converter” of claim 1 is defined as “a second converter which converts the input image data to second image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device”. The Examiner alleges that the specification only discloses conversion of the detection parameters. However, the Examiner’s attention is directed to page 4, second to last line, through page 5, line 3, wherein it is described that the computer calculates color, size, resolution and the like of a hard copy of the output image based on, among other things, the output characteristics of the printer. See also, paragraph [0018] and the last sentence of paragraph [0024]. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the second converter of claim 1 is supported by the specification as originally filed. Of course, the present invention is not limited to the disclosed preferred embodiments.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1 and 3 - 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,652,803, hereinafter *Tachikawa*, in view of USP 6,404,509, hereinafter *Kuwata*. Claim 1 now defines an image processor combination that includes, among other elements, two converters. The first converter converts the

input image data to the first image data for image forming and the second converter converts the input image data to second image data in correspondence to *characteristics of the image output device*. The combination further includes a detector which detects the specified pattern in the second image data converted by the second converter, based on the output inhibition condition stored in said memory device.

In contrast to claim 1, as acknowledged by the Examiner, in *Tachikawa*, the circuit 511 does not convert the image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device. The present invention according to claim 1 converts the image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device so that a more accurate comparison of the image to be printed can be made to the "specified pattern". *Tachikawa* clearly does not recognize the significance of the claimed second converter and does not teach or suggest such a conversion of the input data. The circuit 511 of *Tachikawa* does not "convert" data, as taught by the present invention. Instead, the circuit 511 of *Tachikawa* merely "extracts" the color data so that it can be compared to a predetermined pattern. Note the primary purpose of the circuit 511 is extracting the data. Although it does change the format of the data so that it can be compared to the predetermined pattern, it does not convert the data, as that term is used in the present invention.

The Office Action relies upon *Kuwata* for allegedly suggesting that the circuit 511 of *Tachikawa* be modified so as to correct the image data in correspondence with the image output device. However, *Kuwata* merely teaches converting input image data so that it can be printed by an output device. It does not teach converting input data for comparison purposes in order to increase the accuracy or

efficiency of a comparison or detecting process. The present invention converts input data so that it can be sent to an output device. The present invention teaches converting the input image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device so that a more accurate comparison of the image to be printed can be made to the "specified pattern". Accordingly, there is no suggestion in either *Tachikawa* or *Kuwata* to convert the input image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device so that a more accurate comparison of the image to be printed can be made to the "specified pattern". Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the applied prior art.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, and are thus also patentable over the applied prior art.

Claims 5, 6, and 7 also define combinations that include, among other elements, converting the image data in correspondence to characteristics of the image output device. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, and 7 are also patentable over the applied art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.


In view of the foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections of the application.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: April 27, 2006

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620